



The Qualitative Report

Volume 22 | Number 13

Article 7

12-25-2017

Addressing the Ten Commonly Asked Questions about Qualitative Research in the Philippines

Safary Wa-Mbaleka

Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Wa-MblakeaS@aiaas.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#), and the [Social Statistics Commons](#)

Recommended APA Citation

Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2017). Addressing the Ten Commonly Asked Questions about Qualitative Research in the Philippines. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(13), 3481-3492. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss13/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Addressing the Ten Commonly Asked Questions about Qualitative Research in the Philippines

Abstract

There is no doubt that the need for qualitative research has increased and has been felt all around the world. Once feared, detested, or even not much valued by some, qualitative research has now become the rare bird many people are trying to catch. Unfortunately, as more and more people and institutions try to embrace qualitative research, maybe more damage is being done in the process because of the lack of solid understanding of qualitative research. To pave a strong way to excellence in qualitative research conduct and dissemination, it is important to have an idea of the current state of qualitative research. This paper is based on content analysis of the input from 197 higher education professors, administrators, researchers, graduate and doctoral students from 40 higher education institutions in the Philippines. It is based on 10 most commonly asked questions about qualitative research. These questions are grouped into three major themes: the fundamentals, the methodology, and the trustworthiness of qualitative research. Understanding these commonly asked questions can help us pave better the way to quality capability training in qualitative research.

Keywords

Qualitative Research, Content Analysis, Trustworthiness

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Addressing the Ten Commonly Asked Questions about Qualitative Research in the Philippines

Safary Wa-Mbaleka

Asian Qualitative Research Association
Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies
Silang, Cavite, Philippines

There is no doubt that the need for qualitative research has increased and has been felt all around the world. Once feared, detested, or even not much valued by some, qualitative research has now become the rare bird many people are trying to catch. Unfortunately, as more and more people and institutions try to embrace qualitative research, maybe more damage is being done in the process because of the lack of solid understanding of qualitative research. To pave a strong way to excellence in qualitative research conduct and dissemination, it is important to have an idea of the current state of qualitative research. This paper is based on content analysis of the input from 197 higher education professors, administrators, researchers, graduate and doctoral students from 40 higher education institutions in the Philippines. It is based on 10 most commonly asked questions about qualitative research. These questions are grouped into three major themes: the fundamentals, the methodology, and the trustworthiness of qualitative research. Understanding these commonly asked questions can help us pave better the way to quality capability training in qualitative research. Keywords: Qualitative Research, Content Analysis, Trustworthiness

Introduction

The world is currently presenting seriously complex challenges to social researchers. Statistical analyses may not fully help address these issues. Indeed, “rapid social change and the resulting diversification of life worlds are increasingly confronting social researchers with new social contexts and perspectives” (Flick, 2006, p. 12) that were probably not so complex just a few decades ago. Some of the evident ones today include international wars, heavy international migrations, human trafficking, crime, cybercrime, racial and ethnic conflicts, famine, epidemics, moral and ethical issues in corporations and leadership, and the list goes on. According to Flick, QLR is helpful in addressing such complex issues.

In 2015, the Asian Qualitative Research Association (AQRA) saw the light of day in the Philippines. As of the end of 2017, it was the only known international qualitative research (QLR) organization in Asia. It began as the need rose for the search for and maybe some curiosity about QLR. Although QLR may have been in the Philippines for over a couple of decades, it has witnessed a slow growth, just like many other countries. Although lack of expertise in QLR must be one of the major reasons for this slow integration of QLR, it may also be due to myths that people have developed about QLR in general, as seen in many parts of the world (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Bunkers, Petardi, Pilkington, & Walls, 1996; Ells & Gutfreund, 2006; Harper & Thomson, 2012; Taylor, 2017; Yin, 2015).

As part of assessing the real needs of QLR in the Philippines, this study took place. In this study, the approach was simply to request the research participants to ask two most urgent or important questions that they had in mind about QLR. These questions would help determine areas that cause challenges to those interested in QLR. This understanding would eventually

be helpful in preparing QLR capability-building trainings. This study was important in laying a solid foundation for the work that AQRA envisioned to accomplish in improving the conduct, production, and dissemination of QLR in the Philippines and maybe beyond.

Cursory Literature Review

This article is based on two major interwoven aspects. The first is made of the 10 commonly asked questions about QLR in the Philippines, grouped into three themes; that is, the fundamentals of QLR, QLR methodology, and quality control in QLR. The other is the set of different answers based on existing literature and personal experience. Therefore, the literature review of this paper is simply cursory to introduce the three major themes that emerged from the current study.

Fundamentals of QLR

QLR has seen a significant rise in its acceptance in both scholarly conferences and publications. Previously known to be confusing, QLR is now becoming much more precise in practical guidelines. In fact, within the past 5 years or so, many publications have come out that focus on practical ways of conducting QLR (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Brinkmann, 2013; Charmaz, 2014; Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Creswell, 2013; Creswell & Poth, 2016; Glaser, 2013; Goodyear, Jewiss, Usinger, & Barela, 2014; Harreveld, Danaher, Lawson, Knight, & Busch, 2016; Heigham & Crocker, 2009; Lichtman, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Ritchie, Lewis, Nicholls, & Ormston, 2014; Silverman, 2014, 2016; Ulim, Robinson, & Tolley, 2003; Urquhart, 2013; Wa-Mbaleka, 2017). This sudden focus on practical implementation of QLR may be due to the fact that in the past, QLR was perceived as unclear and confusing to novice researchers. This tremendous contribution seems to be having an important effect on the acceptance and promotion of QLR around the world.

Much of the available literature covers the fundamentals. The common topics discussed in the fundamentals of QLR include, but are not limited to, definition of QLR, philosophical underpinnings, its importance, its origins, its characteristics, topics fit for QLR, difference between quantitative and qualitative research, reality and misconceptions about QLR (Creswell, 2013; Creswell & Poth, 2016; Lichtman, 2013). A number of these topics are addressed in the rest of the paper in the discussion of the first theme that emerged.

QLR Methodology

When talking to people who know nothing or little about QLR, it is common to quickly notice their confusion or misunderstanding about QLR. Some may think that QLR is one research design. Some have asked me what statistical tools are used to analyze QLR data. A number of people that are knowledgeable in QLR view it from their background knowledge of quantitative research. Taking that perspective can only confuse them even more about QLR. It is like brains have been somehow wired to think quantitatively because of the many years of the quantitative research dominance. QLR is a “way of knowing in which a researcher gathers, organizes, and interprets information obtained from humans using his or her eyes and ears and filters” (Lichtman, 2013, p. 4). This is one of the reasons why we believe that a qualitative researcher is an instrument because data collection and analysis are filtered through his or her own perceptions and past experiences. QLR allows multiple ways of collecting and analyzing data following different designs.

In QLR methodology, there are many designs, such as Creswell's (2013) five major ones: case study, grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenology, and narrative inquiry. Additionally, QLR uses several different methods of collecting data, such as individual interviews, group interviews, observations, documents, pictures, videos, and even artifacts (Yin, 2015). Last, QLR uses many different data analysis methods (Bazeley, 2009; Miles et al., 2014). More details are provided in the discussion on QLR methodology in the results of this study. QLR is a big umbrella under which several different designs are found. It relies on many different data collection and analysis methods.

Quality Control in QLR

Maybe one of the major and most persisting criticisms that quantitative researchers and quantitative research experts have consistently made about QLR is that of its validity or reliability, which is known as trustworthiness in QLR (Guba, 1981; Krefting, 1991; Shento, 2004). A number of QLR publications today have addressed this issue effectively and for someone who actually takes time to read, it should no longer be a problem worth arguing about. QLR provides specific criteria and strategies to increase a study's trustworthiness. The last section of the findings of this study focuses solely on this issue.

Research Question

I conducted this study as an effort to understand what AQRA was up to as the organization began planning the capability-building activities on QLR in the Philippines. The research question was, "What two questions are commonly asked about QLR in the Philippines?" Instead of me having to ask questions to the research participants, they were the ones given the opportunity to ask their questions so that they could learn from the answers. The research participants were therefore meant to help assess the current state of knowledge about QLR in the Philippines based on their questions.

Methodology

In this study, I intended to learn the weak areas in the knowledge of QLR from the participants. From the type of questions that the research participants asked, it was possible to know the areas in which they needed help in their QLR learning. Exploring and understanding these areas was important as AQRA was planning multiple institution-based, regional, and national training programs on QLR around the Philippines. In this section, I discuss what was involved in the methodology.

Research Design

This study relied on content analysis as QLR design, specifically the conventional content analysis as discussed by Hsieh and Shannon (2005). This specific content analysis type "allows the researchers to use an inductive approach to data analysis, when data has no predetermined variables or theories" (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015, p. 126). This design was relevant to this study because this study had no clear variables nor preset theories.

Research Setting

This QLR study was conducted in one private and two higher education institutions, and one research organization. In all the four settings, data was collected as part of QLR

trainings. I had been invited to give training on QLR in all the four settings. In all the settings, the goal was to introduce university faculty and some students to QLR. None of the trainings provided during this time was advanced; they were all part of introduction to QLR. For the trainings offered in the three higher education institutions, participants belonged to one institution. Two public universities were in the northern part of the country. The private institution was in the center of the country. As for training for the research organization, participants came from 37 different institutions from many different provinces of the Philippines. The training of that organization was held at a hotel in the southern part of the Philippines, which probably drew more participants from the southern part of the Philippines.

Sampling

The fact that data was collected solely from the training participants makes this a convenience sampling (Creswell, 2013; Creswell & Poth, 2016; Lichtman, 2013). However, given that participants came from 40 different higher education institutions, multiple variation is therefore implied. No data was collected on the demographics of the participants, such as gender, academic level, or socio-economic factors, because they were not that important for this study. This data is therefore not reported in this paper. These trainings took place sometime between the second half of the year 2015 and the first quarter of 2016.

Data Collection

To collect data, I took a few steps. First, I had index cards distributed to all the participants at each of the four training settings, right before the training program. Next, the participants were asked to write down two most important questions that they had about QLR. They were informed that their input was needed as part of the training because, indeed, they were. At the end of the training, I used those index cards to ask those very questions to the training participants to assess how much they had learned from the training. Furthermore, at the end of each training, once all the questions were answered, I informed them that I was planning to use the data on the index card for a possible study. All of them provided permission, even though I had informed them that they could withdraw their index cards if they so wished.

Data Analysis

In data analysis, I used both manifest analysis and latent analysis (Thayer, Evans, McBride, Queen, & Spyridakis, 2007) to classify the meaning of the questions that participants asked. In some cases, participants asked the question exactly as it would eventually appear in this paper; such as “What is qualitative research?” In other cases, different participants structured their questions differently. In such cases, I took the liberty to align those questions with those that described them better, thus relying on latent analysis.

I classified the questions into different codes, then categories, and then from categories, three themes emerged. I counted the recurring codes and categories to determine the 10 most commonly used questions. In this paper, the 10 questions are grouped into three themes.

Ethical Considerations

As indicated earlier, the data used for this study was collected as part of four QLR trainings. These training sessions in four different settings were based on fundamentals of QLR. Participants were simply asked to use an index card to write down two most important questions they each had about QLR. I informed them not to put their names there, as their

names were not needed for the activity. After using these index cards as part of the training, I informed them all that I was planning to use these index cards for my future research study. At that point, anyone who did not wish to participate in the study was asked to remove his or her index card from the collection but no one did. Participation in the study was therefore voluntary and information was kept anonymous since no name was on the index cards.

Researcher's Positioning

I have been learning and conducting QLR since 2011. While this experience may be good to quickly understand data, and classify it into different categories and themes, it may also be disadvantageous that my bias is brought into the study. The outcome of this study was shared at AQRA's first international conference on qualitative research, where some of my research participants had a chance to see the outcome and give their final input. Those who approached me after the presentation were pleased with its outcome and did not see anything that needed to be modified. This presentation served somehow as member check, as it was probably the only way to do member check, given that participants came from several higher education institutions and I had no access to their contact information.

Results

The results of this study are classified into 10 questions that fit in three major themes: fundamentals of QLR, QLR methodology, and trustworthiness in QLR. In this section, each one of the three themes is addressed together with the questions that are presented there. The questions are presented from the most to the least commonly asked question. The following table is the synthesis of how the themes and categories emerged in this study. Data is presented from the most to the least occurring categories.

Table 1: Synthesis of Themes, Categories, and Examples

Themes	Categories	Occurrences	Examples from Data
Methodology	Effective & efficient process of conducting QLR	56	What are the steps to be followed in writing a QLR? How is QLR conducted?
Fundamentals of QLR	General value of QLR	31	What are the advantages of QLR?
	Definition	30	What is QLR? What is the nature of QLR?
Methodology	Different designs	27	How is case study different from grounded theory? How would I know the most appropriate design to use?
Fundamentals of QLR	Difference b/n Quant & QLR	23	What is the difference between conducting a Quant and a QLR study?
	Preference: Quantitative vs. QLR in matter of time/skills	22	What is more preferred: Quant or QLR? Is QLR as good as Quant?
Quality Control	Writing good QLR	17	How can we write a publishable QLR paper?
Methodology	Starting a QLR study	16	How do I begin conducting a QLR study?

Fundamentals of QLR	Topics fit for QLR	15	What topics are timely and have value in QLR? What topics can be made into QLR? What topics are good for QLR?
Methodology	Data analysis methods	14	What is the difference between theme & code? Is there a need for statistical tools?

From Table 1, it is evident that the most important issue from the data is that of how to conduct QLR. It is followed with the need research participants had about learning the advantages of QLR and the definition of QLR. The least mentioned issue was about data analysis. This makes sense given that people could not worry about data analysis before even knowing what QLR is and how to conduct it. The table above provides the foundation on which the 10 most commonly asked questions in the Philippine setting.

Fundamentals of Qualitative Research

The first few commonly asked questions were related to the fundamentals of QLR. While at first it was surprising to see some of the basic questions that were on the index cards, it was encouraging to know that AQRA trainings had its place in the Philippines. These questions were such a strong evidence that AQRA was much needed to provide a platform where people could learn QLR. In this section, I address the first six most commonly asked question, starting with the definition of QLR.

Q1. What is QLR? Different QLR experts define QLR differently. Some focus on the philosophical part of it; others are on data collection or analysis, while still others have some combination between the three (Creswell, 2013). Merriam (2009) defines QLR as a type of research that deals with “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (p. 5). From this definition, it is evident that QLR is primarily about human experiences and the meaning that research participants attribute to those experiences. It is common to see concepts such as qualitative inquiry, interpretive inquiry, or naturalistic approach being used interchangeably in the place of QLR.

Basically, part of the qualitative researcher’s job is to help research participants reflect on their current or past lived experiences in order to understand them better. In the process, the researcher is able to help both the participants and himself or herself to understand better or deeper what the participants (have) experienced or are experiencing. QLR is therefore not about testing variables. It is about human experience and phenomena.

Q2. Why is QLR important? Lichtman (2013) believes that QLR “strategies offer opportunities to examine issues in depth that may yield a clearer understanding of what is happening in certain circumstances and how changes can be made to meet the needs” of people (p. xv). QLR helps explore complex issues. Issues that have no clear variables or where the problem and the context are interconnected are better addressed with QLR than with quantitative research (Merriam, 2009). QLR helps explore problems that statistics cannot help us with.

According to Creswell (2013), QLR fits best when research topics are complex, when in need of empowering people or research participants, when the researcher needs a flexible style to conduct the study, when explaining mechanisms or developing theories, and when numbers are not enough or able to address the problem under exploration. The need for deeper exploration and complexity of the research problem play an important role in choosing QLR over quantitative research. QLR provides the flexibility needed for such research problems.

Q3. What is the difference between quantitative research and QLR? The difference can be discussed more distinctively from five different aspects, as seen in Johnson and Christensen (2017). First, what is commonly known is that quantitative research relies solely on numbers while QLR uses qualitative data collected through QLR methods such as interviews, observations, documents, photos, pictures, and artifacts. Second, quantitative research is concerned with testing theories and hypotheses while QLR focuses on generating hypotheses and theories, and explores issues in depth. Third, quantitative research is based on the assumption that human behavior is regular and predictable while QLR assumes that reality is situational, contextual, personal, and therefore unpredictable. Fourth, quantitative research is done in controlled settings while QLR is preferably done in natural settings. Last, while quantitative research focuses on relationships between pre-established variables, QLR is about understanding complex issues, phenomena, processes, and lived experiences from a much more holistic perspective. Novices who are interested in this discussion may be directed to Creswell (2012) for a more elaborated discussion on the distinction between quantitative research and QLR.

Q4. What is better: quantitative or QLR? None is superior over the other (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2012). They have different goals and use different designs and methods. They are both useful. They simply help us address problems from two different perspectives. For this reason, quantitative researchers and qualitative researchers should not criticize each other. They need to understand and accept the reality that the world needs them both. The world has issues that require quantitative research, others that require QLR, while others need mixed-methods approaches. The nature of the research problem should determine what approach to use.

Q5. What topics fit best for QLR? The common agreement among QLR experts about the types of topics to explore in QLR is that these topics should be complex, with no preselected variables (Creswell, 2013; Lichtman, 2003). Additionally, Creswell (2013) emphasizes that QLR is needed when the research study is about empowering the research participants, when in need of a flexible research approach, when the goal is to explain mechanisms, to develop theories or hypotheses, or simply when statistics are not able to address a given research problem. Basically, any problem that can be addressed using quantitative research should use that approach. Complex issues that require deep exploration should be addressed through QLR.

Q6. How do we analyze QLR? Although thematic analysis seems to be commonly used in many QLR manuscripts, there are many ways of analyzing QLR data (Bazeley, 2009; Miles et al., 2014). For instance, data analysis may follow the steps of generating theory (Charmaz, 2014), or as Yin (2014) puts it, QLR data analysis can be focused on building models, explanations, relationships, logic models, or cross-case synthesis. Additionally, data analysis can be done by research setting, research participant, or research question (Miles et al., 2014). Flexibility and creativity in QLR allow the researcher to analyze data in ways that best fit the research problem.

Theme 2: Qualitative Research Methodology

The second set of questions that were commonly asked in the data were aligned well with QLR methodology. They were directly related with the research design and methods. Some participants wished to know whether there were some specific QLR designs. Others wished to know the process of conducting a QLR study. Such questions demonstrated the confusion or maybe the limited knowledge that many people had about QLR. This theme is made of three questions that were all related to QLR methodology.

Q7. Are there different designs in QLR? If so, on what basis do they differ? Yes, QLR has many different research designs, although novice qualitative researchers may find

them significantly overlapping. Practice with different QLR designs seems to be a good way to distinguish them, in addition extensive reading on each one of them. Creswell (2013) provides a long, but not exhaustive list of designs. He specifically synthesizes case study, grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenology, and narrative inquiry. Maybe these are some of the commonly used ones in social research. There is, however, an emergence of new ones such as photovoice (Rosario, Domocmat, & Oniashvili, 2016; wang, 1999; wang & Burris, 1997), virtual ethnography (Hine, 2000), and netnography (Kozinets, 2015). With the large selection of QLR designs today, it is really not advisable to conduct a general QLR study. It is important to select one specific design and follow it closely.

The difference between the various QLR designs is found on the basis of each design's philosophical underpinnings and purpose, data collection and analysis. For instance, case study and narrative inquiry may be focused more on describing phenomena or lived experiences while critical research is about challenging the status quo and oppressive practices. Grounded theory must lead to an emerging theory as the final result of the study. In data collection, some difference may also be seen. For instance, in phenomenology, interviews seem to play a more important role than any other means of data collection. Also, the philosophical assumptions of a design dictate how to collect data and the type of data to collect and how to interpret it. Each design has its assumptions on how data is to be interpreted.

Q8. How does someone start a QLR? There is no doubt that QLR is “an intricate fabric composed of minute threads, many colors, different textures, and various blends of materials” (Creswell, 2013, p. 42). The researcher's job is to weave all these into one beautiful piece of art that other scholars can easily appreciate. It therefore requires some special skills in planning and carrying out a QLR study. To start a QLR project, the researcher needs to pick a topic that fits for QLR, as explained above. The researcher must be passionate or curious about the topic. Additionally, the researcher must have a logical map of the study, align the map with the chosen QLR design, and have a clear connection of the topic to a theory or set of theories (Merriam, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Wa-Mbaleka, 2014, 2016). Merriam (2009) and Lichtman (2013) propose that a QLR study should start with the selection of a topic from the existing literature, from scholarly conferences, from daily practice, from a paper the researcher may have written before, from a newsletter or news article, from a textbook, or from an existing theory. It can also start with people, events, place, or concepts. It is important that the researcher approach the research topic from QLR perspective from the very beginning.

Q9. What are the general steps to conduct QLR? There are similarities of steps taken to conduct quantitative and QLR. The researcher identifies a specific research problem, prepares a theoretical framework (not necessarily needed in grounded theory), prepares a complete review of the literature (with the exception of grounded theory), determines the population and sample, collects and analyzes data qualitatively, presents findings and discusses them, draws conclusions, and make sure to receive and integrate feedback, when necessary, from research participants and from peers. These are basically the same steps taken in quantitative research. The difference is found, however, in the emphasis each approach has on each component.

In quantitative research, the focus is on preset variables while the focus of QLR is on a complex issue with no clear variables. In quantitative research, the researcher needs to develop a theoretical or conceptual framework, whereas in QLR, the theoretical framework is expected. While the research questions are primarily on variables in quantitative research, they are on phenomena and how these phenomena are experienced in QLR. Data is collected quantitatively in quantitative research while evidently QLR relies on qualitative data. Therefore, the two approaches focus on different types of data. Data analysis in quantitative research is about running statistical analysis while statistics play a minor or no role in QLR data analysis.

Quantitative research statistically tests hypotheses in data interpretation while in QLR there is no statistical testing. In QLR, the researcher increases the trustworthiness of the study by having peer review and member check; that is, by obtaining a review of the research outcome by the research participants. These steps are not found in quantitative research. In the discussion section in both quantitative research and QLR, reference is expected on the theoretical or conceptual framework and on existing literature; although this expectation may be much higher in QLR than it is in quantitative research.

Theme 3: Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research

Scholars with a strong background in quantitative research asked questions that had to deal with validity and reliability. These two concepts stand for trustworthiness in QLR (Creswell, 2013; Guba, 1981; Lichtman, 2013; Shento, 2004). This question is commonly asked probably due to the persisting myth that QLR is not trustworthy due to the researcher's subjectivity (Yin, 2015).

Q10. How do we write a QLR paper of high quality? According to Miles et al. (2014), trustworthiness is assessed through the study's credibility, consistency, dependability, transferability, confirmability, and utilization. These authors describe what each concept means and how to meet the requirements for each of them. To address this final question, a list of practical strategies is presented here to increase a QLR study's trustworthiness.

To increase trustworthiness, the researcher is expected to use member checking (by sending the completed manuscript to and receiving feedback from the research participants), peer review from colleagues, adequate engagement in data collection, triangulation of data (or other means of triangulation), researcher's positioning (where the researcher states his or her bias), audit trail (or thick description of what actually took place in the conduct of the study), and present negative evidence, where it is reported (Merriam, 2009; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Miles et al., 2014; Yin, 2014). Additionally, the findings of a QLR study are expected to be physically and intellectually accessible (Miles et al., 2014), and help address real people's problems. Last, Creswell (2013) recommends that the QLR report be written in a persuasive way so that it can be engaging to the readers. It must have evidence of following high ethical standards. It must have coherence, new insight, and clear practical implications. Of practical importance is Wa-Mbaleka's (2017) list of 35 criteria of assessing the quality of a QLR study. This set of criteria is aligned closely with the different steps taken in conducting a QLR study. Readers concerned with this question are encouraged to follow it for practical guidelines.

Conclusion

The 10 questions that were commonly asked in this study demonstrated that the Philippines was still at the infancy of QLR. It explained the need for sustained quality training about, beginning with the basics of QLR. The need was also evidenced in learning how to conduct QLR in a practical way. This need may have been expressed because of the commonly predictable structure that is characteristic of quantitative research. The last expressed need was about how to increase the trustworthiness of QLR, given all the subjectivity that is involved.

The answers provided in this article are meant to provide a primer for novice qualitative researchers, primarily in the Philippines. It is in no way exhaustive. Readers are encouraged to explore further the literature that is provided here and other sources on QLR that are increasingly coming out. Once people understand what QLR is, how important it is, and how to conduct it, they learn to appreciate its depth and its effectiveness in addressing current, complex research problems.

More QLR courses should be incorporated in the current curricular programs in the Philippines. A good step in that direction has started with the launch of an introductory course to QLR in Grade 11, as of 2016. While this plan is important to the increase of QLR in the Philippines, teachers of QLR in Grade 11 need to be trained because many may have never taken any QLR course before. AQRA and other research organizations need to double the effort of providing QLR training programs all around this country. More and more higher education institutions need to provide more support to the conduct of QLR through publication, theses and dissertations, since QLR is still frowned at in many places. More QLR textbooks specific to Grade 11 students should be published so that this introductory course to QLR can effectively lay the foundation of the future QLR learning of the students.

When trainings are given, research should be conducted to assess the impact of such trainings on QLR production and dissemination. More research should also be done on the current acceptability level of QLR for publication in Philippine scholarly journals and in thesis and dissertation writing. Last, a study should be conducted to assess the trend of QLR production over the past several years to be able to understand which direction the country is headed in, as far as QLR is concerned.

References

- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol13/iss4/2>
- Bazeley, P. (2009). Analysing qualitative data: more than "identifying themes." *Malaysian Journal of Qualitative Research*, 2, 6-22.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Ally and Bacon.
- Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bunkers, S. S., Petardi, L. A., Pilkington, F. B., & Walls, P. A. (1996). Challenging the myths surrounding qualitative research in nursing. *Nursing Science Quarterly*, 9(1), 33-37.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ells, C., & Gutfreund, S. (2006). Myths about qualitative research and the Tri-Council Policy Statement. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 31(3), 361-373. doi:10.1353/cjs.2006.0053
- Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glaser, B. G. (2013). Staying open: The use of theoretical codes in GT. *The Grounded Theory Review*, 12(1), 3-8.
- Goodyear, L., Jewiss, J., Usinger, J., & Barela, E. (Eds.). (2014). *Qualitative inquiry in evaluation: From theory to practice*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.
- Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 29, 75-91.

- Harper, D., & Thomson, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Qualitative research methods in mental health and psychotherapy: A guide for students and practitioners*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Harreveld, B., Danaher, M., Lawson, C., Knight, B. A., & Busch, G. (Eds.). (2016). *Constructing methodology for qualitative research*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heigham, J., & Crocker, R. A. (Eds.). (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Hine, C. (2000). *Virtual ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. doi:10.1177/1049732305276687
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2017). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (6 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kozinets, R. (2015). *Netnography: Redefined*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 45(3), 214-222.
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. M., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students & researchers* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Rosario, A. H., Domocmat, M. C., & Oniashvili, S. (2016). Still a teen, already a mother: Understanding the teen motherhood phenomenon through photovoice. *International Forum*, 19(2), 47-63. Retrieved from <http://internationalforum.aiias.edu/images/vol19no02/3ARosarioEtal.pdf>
- Shento, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), 63-75.
- Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting qualitative data*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Silverman, D. (Ed.) (2016). *Qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Taylor, J. W. (2017). Deconstructing myths in qualitative research. *International Forum*, 20(1), 18-30. Retrieved from <http://ojs.aiias.edu/index.php/ojs/article/view/192/192>
- Thayer, A., Evans, M., McBride, A., Queen, M., & Spyridakis, J. (2007). Content analysis as a best practice in technical communication research. *Technical Writing and Communication*, 37(3), 267-279. doi:10.2190/TW.37.3.c
- Ulim, P. R., Robinson, E. T., & Tolley, E. E. (2003). *Qualitative methods in public health: A field guide for applied research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Urquhart, C. (2013). *Grounded theory for qualitative research: A practical guide*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2014). *Publish or perish: Fear no more*. Quezon City, Philippines: CentralBooks.
- Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2015). Factors leading to limited faculty publications in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Forum*, 18(2), 121-141.
- Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2016). *Thesis and dissertation writing: Fear no more*. Silang, Philippines: Oikos Bilios Publishing House.

- Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2017). Fostering quality in qualitative research: A list of practical strategies. *International Forum*, 20(1), 58-80. Retrieved from <http://ojs.aiias.edu/index.php/ojs/article/view/195>
- wang, C. C. (1999). Photovoice: A participatory action research strategy applied to women's health. *Journal of Women's Health*, 8(2), 185-192. Retrieved from http://www.public.iastate.edu/~bestler/arts_based_articles/1999_Liebert_Photovoice.pdf
- wang, C. C., & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behavior*, 24(3), 369-387. Retrieved from <https://goo.gl/bKn47C> doi:10.1177/109019819702400309
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (7th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Yin, R. K. (2015). *Qualitative research from start to finish* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Author Note

Safary Wa-Mbaleka is the founding and current president of the Asian Qualitative Research Association. He teaches and provides many trainings on qualitative research, mostly at higher education institutions and at research organization events. Please direct correspondence to Wa-MblakeaS@aiias.edu.

Copyright 2017: Safary Wa-Mbaleka and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2017). Addressing the ten commonly asked questions about qualitative research in the Philippines. *The Qualitative Report*, 22(13), 3481-3492. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss13/7>
